

Brigham Young University Law School  
**BYU Law Digital Commons**

---

Utah Supreme Court Briefs (1965 –)

---

1970

**Jack Christianson and :Murl Christianson v. Joanne Debry : Brief  
of Appellant**

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/uofu\\_sc2](https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/uofu_sc2)

Original Brief submitted to the Utah Supreme Court; funding for digitization provided by the Institute of Museum and Library Services through the Library Services and Technology Act, administered by the Utah State Library, and sponsored by the S.J. Quinney Law Library; machine-generated OCR, may contain errors. Jackson B. Howard v. Attorney for Appellant

---

**Recommended Citation**

Brief of Appellant, *Christianson v. Debry*, No. 11685 (1970).  
[https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/uofu\\_sc2/4826](https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/uofu_sc2/4826)

This Brief of Appellant is brought to you for free and open access by BYU Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Utah Supreme Court Briefs (1965 –) by an authorized administrator of BYU Law Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [hunterlawlibrary@byu.edu](mailto:hunterlawlibrary@byu.edu).

**In the Supreme Court of the State of Utah**

JACK CHRISTIANSON and  
MURL CHRISTIANSON,

*Plaintiffs and Appellants*

vs.

Case No.  
11685

JOANNE DEBRY,

*Defendant and Respondent*

**BRIEF OF APPELLANT**

Appeal from a Judgment of the Third District Court  
Salt Lake County, State of Utah

The Honorable Aldon J. Anderson, Judge

JACKSON B. HOWARD, for:  
HOWARD AND LEWIS  
120 East 300 North  
Provo, Utah  
Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
and Appellants

JAMES P. COWLEY, for  
PUGSLEY, HAYES, WATKISS,  
CAMPBELL AND COWLEY  
Suite 400 El Paso Natural  
Gas Building  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111  
Attorneys for Defendant  
and Respondent

FILED

12-1-82

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
NATURE OF THE CASE .....	1
DISPOSITION IN LOWER COURT .....	1
RELIEF SOUGHT ON APPEAL .....	2
STATEMENT OF FACTS .....	2
ARGUMENT .....	3
<p>THE COURT ERRED IN ALLOWING DEFENDANT'S EXPERT MEDICAL WITNESS TO TESTIFY AS TO THE POSSIBILITY THAT PLAINTIFF MURL CHRISTIANSON'S SYMPTOMS WERE CAUSED BY A PREEXISTING CONDITION.</p>	
Chief Consol. Min. Co. v. Salisbury, 61 Utah 66, 210 Pd 929 (1922). ....	4
"Expert and Opinion Evidence", § 44, 31 Am. Jur. 2d 548 (1967). ....	4
Kujawa v. Baltimore Transit Co., 224 Md. 195, 167 A.2d 96, 89 A.L.R2d 1166 (1961). ....	4
Moore V. Denver & R.G.W.R.R. Co., 4 Utah 2d 255, 292 P.2d 849 (1956). ....	4

# In the Supreme Court of the State of Utah

---

JACK CHRISTIANSON and  
MURL CHRISTIANSON,

*Plaintiffs and Appellants*

vs.

JOANNE DEBRY,

*Defendant and Respondent*

Case No.  
11685

---

## BRIEF OF APPELLANT

---

### NATURE OF THE CASE

This is an action for personal injuries and property damage caused by the negligence of the defendant.

### DISPOSITION IN THE LOWER COURT

The District Court found defendant negligent as a matter of law and entered judgment on a jury verdict in the amount of \$3,500.00. The Court denied plaintiffs' Motion for New Trial, which motion was based primarily on the same ground raised here on appeal, i.e., error in the admission of certain testimony by defendant's expert witness, Dr. Allred.

## RELIEF SOUGHT ON APPEAL

Plaintiffs request that this Honorable Court grant them a new trial on the issue of damages.

## STATEMENT OF FACTS

During the course of the trial the court allowed counsel for defendant, over the objection of plaintiffs' counsel, to question defendant's expert witness, Dr. Allred, as follows:

Q. (By Mr. Cowley) Considering the nature of the degenerative disk disease you have observed in Mrs. Christianson, I want to ask if you have an opinion as to whether or not that condition could account for the headaches.

A. Yes, it could.

Q. Do you have an opinion?

MR. HOWARD: Your Honor, I am going to object to the question on the basis it "could" because "could" is not the proper question to ask of the witness if he is asking an opinion because we are not interested in possibilities.

Q. (By Mr. Cowley) I'll ask you again Doctor if you have an opinion within the degree of medical probability that that condition could cause the headaches.

MR. HOWARD: I make the same objection.

THE COURT: Objection is overruled.

MR. HOWARD: Your Honor, he has used the word "could".

MR. COWLEY: I said within the degree of medical probability.

THE COURT: It is a matter of weight for the Jury. The objection is overruled.

THE WITNESS: Within the degree of medical probability it can cause headaches.

Q. (By Mr. Cowley) Within the degree of medical probability can it cause the soreness or stiffness of the neck?

A. Yes, sir.

MR. HOWARD: May I have a continuing objection to that?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: You may.

MR. HOWARD: To the manner in which this question is framed. I think it is objectionable.

THE COURT: You may. (R. 211)

On two occasions, in chambers, prior to submitting the case to the jury, the plaintiff requested a special instruction for the jury to disregard the objectionable testimony. This request was not recorded in the record, but the plaintiff believes the defendant will not dispute the request having been made.

### ARGUMENT

THE COURT ERRED IN ALLOWING DEFENDANT'S EXPERT MEDICAL WITNESS TO TESTIFY AS TO THE POSSIBILITY THAT PLAINTIFF MURL CHRISTIANSON'S SYMPTOMS WERE CAUSED BY A PREEXISTING CONDITION.

It is a well-established rule of law that "an ex-

pert's opinion, if not stated in terms of the certain, must at least be stated in terms of the probable, and not merely of the possible." 31 Am.Jur.2d 548, "Expert and Opinion Evidence", § 44 (1967).

In *Moore v. Denver & R.G.W.R.R. Co.*, 4 Utah 2d 255, 292 P.2d 849 (1956) expert testimony was allowed by the trial court to the effect that "*it was possible* that the accident initiated the condition" of nerve irritation and consequent disability for which plaintiff might recover. 4 Utah 2d 257, 292 P.2d 880. The Supreme Court held that "since no affirmative evidence was offered on this issue" the speculative testimony of the witness, together with his "learned and convincing discourse on ruptured discs" made it likely that the jury would consider the disputed point as proven and that "therefore, an instruction should have been given to cure a possible prejudice." 4 Utah 2d 259, 292 P.2d 851.

To the same effect is *Chief Consol. Min. Co. v. Salisbury*, 61 Utah 66, 210 P. 929 (1922) in which the court held insufficient to support liability testimony of an expert witness to the effect that the accident in question "might" have accelerated the diseased condition of the plaintiff's heart and hastened his death. Cf. *Kujawa v. Baltimore Transit Co.*, 224 Md. 195, 167 A.2d 96, 89 A.L.R. 2d 1166 (1961): "The rulings of this court have been consistent in holding that an expert witness must base his opinion on probability and

not on mere possibility.” 89 A.L.R. 2d 1173.

The questions of defendant’s counsel clearly called for conclusions by the expert witness as to “possibility” rather than “probability” that the plaintiff’s injuries were caused by a pre-existing condition. Dr. Allred testified not that the condition “did” or “probably did” cause plaintiff’s headaches, but only that it “could” have done so. The assertion that cause A “could have” or “can” produce effect B is clearly the grammatical equivalent of an assertion that B “possibly” follows from A. The mere prefacing of a question with the formula, “within a degree of medical probability,” could, etc, does not convert such speculative testimony given in response thereto into an assertion that the causal connection is “probable”.



## CONCLUSION

It follows from the foregoing that allowing the objectionable testimony to go to the jury was prejudicial error and that plaintiffs' motion for new trial should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Jackson B. Howard, for:

HOWARD AND LEWIS

120 East 300 North

Provo, Utah 8401

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

and Appellants

Mailed a copy of the foregoing, postage prepaid, to James P. Cowley, Pugsley, Hayes, Watkiss, Campbell and Cowley, Suite 400 El Paso Natural Gas Building, Salt Lake City, Utah 84111, this ..... day of July, 1969.

---